

THE  
Middle-Way

In One Paper of  
JUSTIFICATION.

With indifferency between  
*PROTESTANT & PAPIST.*

---

*By J. Humphreys.*

---

*Doing nothing by Partiality.*

---

L O N D O N,

Printed for *E. Parkhurst*, at the Three  
Bibles in Cheap-side. 1672.

THE

# Middle-West

OF THE

By J. H. H. H.



## Of Justification.

**I**T is a trouble to to me often, in reading Polemical Divinity, to see how men that walk in a vain shew to others, and disquiet themselves in vain, are governed by Prejudice and Party: it is a hard thing many times, and a man must be very witty, and strain himself to pick a fault in his Adversary, for matter of contention; when a little pains only to understand him, and the least candour, or, but a bare equality, in the interpretation, would bring him whether he would or no, almost, to reconciliation. The truth is, the Papists do abuse the Protestants, and the Protestants abuse the Papists, and that is the summe of most of our great Controversies. I judge the like between Arminian and Calvinists, and other Contenders. If Luther hath said it, or Calvin hath said it, it must be Heretical: and if the Council of Trent have delivered it, or Bellarmine said so, it must be dangerous, it favours of the Harlot, it is the abominable doctrine of the Church of Rome. Amongst the many contests between this Church and us, there are few which are carryed on with that affection and concernment, as the dispute of Justification. St. Paul was the first that engaged upon this point, and not without some warmth against those that opposed him. James is the next that hath spoken of this Subject. The Primitive Church and the Fathers after them have accorded pretty well with both; but the School-men as I take it, by pressing some passages of the Fathers over-closely, having obscured the grace

of the Gospel, our Protestant Churches have risen up as it were under the *standard* of St. Paul, that is *under his words*, and the Roman Church under the words of St. James, and come out into a set Battel, which serving only to raise up *dust, darkness and doubt* among the most, it is a *conference* I count between the *Leaders*, I mean a plain understanding or adjustment only of the *one* united certain sense of *both Apostles*, inspired by the same holy Spirit, that will, that must, and does give light to the intelligent and impartial, to uncloud the errors on each side, and end the quarrel.

The word *justify* is from the word *just*, and one may be said to be made or rendred just, by *infusion*, or by *plea*. Our Protestant Divines do all teach us that the word is a forensical term, and is to be understood in opposition to *condemnation*, for which they have good Scripture: the Papists doe tell us, that to justify a sinner, is to make him righteous, and understand by it, in effect, the same thing with *sanctification*. St. Augustine it must be acknowledged hath lead them this way. *Gratificavit nos in dilecto, gratificavit a gratia, sicut justificavit a justitia. De bona perseverantia, c. 6. Christus justificat impium faciendo ex impio Christianum. Christ does justify the ungodly, by making him of one that is wicked, a holy man, or a Christian, Contra litteras Petiliani l. 3. c. 45.* There is his book *De spiritu & littera*, where he hath the same up, and from whence a man may pick out his judgment on this point rather then any where else that I know. I did expect to find more, *De fide & operibus*, but I perceive it does mainly respect another matter: we may see also his Book, *De libero arbitrio & gratia*. The judgment then of this Father which leads the Schools in their disputes about these matters, as to the main, comes to this. That God of his own goodness only, or free will, to wit, according to Election, does vouchsafe the holy Spirit to some Persons, who does infuse his grace in their hearts; which grace is that which disposes them to all righteousness, and is the same according to him, otherwhere with Charity, which fulfils the law, and so justifies us. And in this sense does he tell us, that, *Bona opera sequuntur justificatum, non precedunt justificandum*; that is, *Good works do follow the Person justified, and do not go before justification.*



cation. The meaning whereof with him is, that we must first have this grace infused ( which habitually enclines to our whole duty both unto God and to our Neighbour ), that is, the making the ungodly a just man, before he can do any thing that is good. *Pelagius* doctrine was, that grace is given according to our merits: but *St. Augustine's* doctrine is, that grace is first given, and good works follow.

When the Apostle then does tell us that we are justified by grace, this Father I say understands by it this infused grace, that is, an habit of righteousness infused into the heart, for fulfilling the law of God, and so justifies. *Lex data est ut quaereretur gratia, gratia data est, ut lex impleretur.* The law is given that grace may be sought, and grace is given that the law may be fulfilled. *De spir. & lit. c. 19.* In correspondence to this, when the Apostle says we are justified by faith, he tells us, that it is by its *impetration* of this grace. *Impetrat orando*, he has it in another place. Faith carries us to God, when we cannot fulfill his commandments our selves, and by the infusion of this habit he enables us to do it, and thereby are we justified in his Opinion. *Quod operam lex minando imperat, hoc fidei lex credendo impetrat. Lege operum dicit Deus fac quod jubeo: lege fidei dicitur Deo da quod jubes.* That which the law of works requires by threats, the law of faith obtains by believing. In the law of works, God says, *doe what I command*: in the law of faith, we say to God, *give what thou commandest.* *Ib. c. 12.* *Opus quod qui fecerit vivet in eo, non fit nisi justificatio: justificatio autem ex fide impetratur.* The works which he that does shall live in them, are not done but by the justified: and justification is impetrated by faith. *c. 19.* *Lex non evacuatur sed statuitur per fidem, quia fides impetrat gratiam qua lex impleatur.* The law is not made void, but established by faith, because faith fetches from God his grace whereby the law is fulfilled. *c. 30.* Now when he accounts that this grace which makes us just, or this infused grace is obtained by faith it is plain, that he must account that good works do follow it. Upon which there is a difficulty might be proposed to this Father, the spirit infuses this grace: does faith then precede the spirit that infuses it, or not? If it doe, then must our faith be of our selves, when our good works are

are of his gift. And this indeed was his judgement, while he wrote this book, though after he recalled it in others. See particularly *De gra. & lib. arb. c. 5.* Where he is proving that our conversion, and so faith it self is from God.

To go on, when the Apostle does oppose this *faith* and *grace* unto *works*, he is put to it: for, when by *grace* he understands nothing but infused righteousness for the fulfilling the law, how does that oppose *works*? For the making his notion hold therefore, by works in opposition to grace and faith he understands *Opera sine adjutorio & dono Dei, works without the assistance and gift of God.* In short, our justification is not of works, which are done before we have grace: but of works which proceed from it. *Israel non pervenit ad justitiam, quare? quia non ex fide sed tanquam ex operibus: id est, tanquam eam per semet ipsos operantes, non in se credentes operari Deum. Israel attained not to righteousness, why? because he sought it not of faith, but as it were of works: that is, as working it out of themselves, and not believing in God to work it in them. Ib. c. 19.* So *De gra. & lib. arb. c. 8.* Quomodo non ex operibus ne forte quis extollatur? audi & intellige, non ex operibus dictum tanquam tuis ex te ipso tibi existentibus, sed tanquam his in quibus te Deus finxit. Ipsius enim figmentum sumus creati in Christo Jesu in operibus bonis. *How, not of works that one may not boast? hear and understand, it is said not of works as thy own done by thee of thy self: but of those as in which thou art created by God, for we are his workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works.* Again, Ignorantes Dei justitiam, id est, quæ ex Deo est homini ut sit justus: & suam volentes constituere, tanquam per eorum non adjutam divinitus arbitrium lex possit impleri. *Being ignorant of the righteousness of God, that is, which comes from God to man, to make him righteous: and being willing to establish their own, that is, as if by their own free-will without the divine help, they were able to perform the law.* Contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum. l. 3 c. 1.

In this doctrine of the Father, there are three things where-in he is out.

The first is in his conception of *grace*. When *works* and *grace* are opposed we are not to apprehend with him, that *grace* is taken

taken for any thing infused in the Soul, which is inherent grace : for *works* and *grace* in this sense have no opposition, the one being the fruits of the other. But by grace, we must understand the grace of God without us, the grace which is in God, that is, his favour or the condescension of God to us in this matter. And thus is the opposition very plain. That which is of *debt* is one thing, and that which is of *favour* another. *Not of works*, that is, not of debt, or of what would make the reward to be due : *but of grace*, that is, when it is not due, but of favour. The certain truth is this, God Almighty gave to man a law according to his nature, which he repeated to the Jews, and if any man were able to keep this law according to the Covenant of Nature, then should his justification be of *right* and *due*, according to the law of his creation : but the Apostle does most industriously prove, that neither *Jew* nor *Gentile* was able to produce these *works*, and consequently if there be any, whether *Jew* or *Gentile* that are justified, it must be by *grace*, because it cannot be of *right*, or what he may challenge by the law upon that account. Grace then, and mark it well, is the accepting of any mans person, or thing which is done, when one may choose, or when in justice one were not bound to do it. Accordingly, when God justifies us by grace, it is his accepting of us as righteous, or of what we doe, for righteousness, and rewarding it as such, when according to his law it would not stand, but he might condemn us for it. Let any who have better words use them, I regard only my sense. And here may we have an answer to a question of great heat amongst our Divines. The Gospel requires Faith, Repentance, and new Obedience, and how then are we justified and saved by *grace*, or how then is grace *free*, when it is not vouchsafed but upon *conditions* ? This difficulty hath made some run into that extreame, that the Covenant of grace is without condition: but I say readily, the grace of God, or of the Gospel is *free*, in that he accepts of the sinners faith and repentance, when he needs not, or when according to the *law*, he is not tyed to it, unless mans obedience were perfect. That which our Divines do offer usually is this: It is free because it is not of merit, mans belief and obedience cannot merit any thing at the hands of God, and much less salvation, as well from  
the

the disproportion of our performances, or momentary sufferings, to the eternal weight of glory, with other the like reasons, as that we do herein but our duty, and he helps us also in the doing, which are the cheif reasons that are urged. This information does labour I think with some defect of light. If man had performed the condition of the Covenant of works, it might upon these reasons have been said, that life and salvation, had been still of *grace* and *free*, as not merited, while these considerations hinder merit: whereas the Apostle industriously opposing the sinners being justified, or saved freely by Gods grace, to justification by works, or the deeds of the law, does account, if man were justified by works, it would be of *debt*. Could a man (I say) have performed the condition of the Covenant of Nature, the Apostle accounts still in his reckoning that then had the reward been of *debt* or *merit*, and if a mans own Conscience could not accuse him of sin, he had no need of *grace*: but now sayes he, seeing both *Jew* and *Gentile* fall short hereof, and all are become guilty before God, there is none is, or can be justified, but it must be *gratis*, *freely* in opposition to that performance. To lend more help against this difficulty we must distinguish of merit. There is a debt or merit of *commutative* justice, or of governing *distributive* justice. It is impossible that any should engage the Almighty in a debt of the former sort. Of the latter sort, there is a debt or merit upon *compact*, or upon *strict retaliation*. It is true, that there is nothing man does, or could do in the state of innocency, had he continued perfect, can merit, or could have merited any reward from God, upon the score of a strict retaliation, or returning good for good, any more then upon commutative justice, because there is nothing we can do to our Governour, who is infinite, to *benefit*, or *hurt* him: and so these reasons before named of our Divines and others, may come in if they please. *Can a man bee profitable to God*, sayes *Eliphas* to *Job*. And, *who hath given to the Lord that he should receive of him* sayes the Apostle. But the case is not so (under their favour) with a debt, or merit upon *compact*. A compact then may be twofold. Upon terms that are *equal*: and upon terms *unequal*. In a compact upon terms that are equal we are to know that the reward does become debt, or may be said to be of merit, notwithstanding by way of strict retaliation,

tion, or upon an account of equal benefit, the performance of the condition would require no such matter. For instance, if I agree to give a man half a crown for his dayes work, I must pay it him as *debt*, though the emolument to me by the work done, is not worth it, nay, though if I had not agreed, I should have thought much to give him half the money : but in a compact upon terms *unequal*, as if I promise a poor man a shilling for his leading my horse to the next stile, though I am bound to give it to him when he has done so, yet is the shilling an *Almes*, or the reward of *grace*, (or favour) for all that. Now I account when God in the Covenant of Nature, hath made eternal life to be due upon exact obedience, it is a compact upon terms but *equal*, he that *dorth* them, *shall live in them*: So long as man was innocent, God in justice could not punish him : and so long as he continued but in the same state he was created, he must be happy, and eternally so, which is the same thing with *salvation*, only it could not be called by that name, till man was first *lost*. Neither may Gods giving him ability, or his doing no more then his duty, be any hindrance to him of meriting upon this compact, any more then my letting the man I have hired, to work with my shovel or mattock, and his doing only what he was bid, hinder him of his wages : the reason is, because the compact supposes that if he does but his duty, with the strength that God has given, or does give him, he shall be justified and blessed. If *Adam* then had, or we could perform the condition of *Nature*, which is to live perfectly without offending God at all, the reward no doubt (seeing the Apostle so accounts of it) should be of *merit* or *debt*, for that was a Covenant upon terms but *equal*, it being *meet* that God should deal benignly with us as his *Creatures*, while we carry our selves towards him as our *Maker*, and that he should not deprive us of any benefit, to which we were *created*, before we forfeited it by our transgression. But now when he gives us the reward, which is *eternal life through his Son*, upon an obedience which is imperfect (that is by a new Covenant upon terms *unequal*) he gives it *freely*, seeing he gives it without performance of the condition at first required to obtain the same. The sum of this is, the *restoral* justice of God is either under the *strict* law, or under

der the *law of grace*. When our Divines then say that our works do not merit, they say true, but they must be rightly understood: when they give us those reasons for it, at first named, their reasons are good against all merit of *commutative* justice, and of strict retaliation in *distributive* justice, and against merit *ex pacto* under the *strict law*, or upon terms that are equal: but as to a merit of compact under the law of grace, *secundum regimen gratia patet*, they are not good. When by some of these reasons therefore, our works, if they were perfect, should not yet be meritorious, which is a contradiction to the Apostle, I must conclude that the reason why grace is said to be *free* by St Paul, is not because our works do not merit upon their reasons, or do not merit with a merit of strict retaliation, or, *ex pacto*, upon terms that are equal, which their reasons only exclude: but because we do not come up to those (those works), which notwithstanding their reasons, would merit if we did perform them; that is, because they come short of that condition, which by Gods first compact according to *nature*, should make the reward to be of debt, and yet God accepts of them for Christs sake, and rewards them no less then if they did. That the grace of justification is purchased by Christ, it is apparent in the words that are ordinarily joynd with it, *Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus*. But if the notion of *free* did lye in the conception, our Divines ordinarily frame, then could it not be the fruit of Christs purchase, for how can that which is *purchased*, in their sense be *free*? whereas it is this grace certainly, is the main fruit of Christs redemption, to wit, that the new Covenant should be established, so as the poor sinner whose Conscience does condemn him of the breach of that law, which is *written in his heart*, and according to which he should dye, hath yet a refuge to Gods mercy, which he is said, (I pray pardon me the repetition) to bestow *freely*, because man hath not the works which should make the reward due to him. Lo then how the grace of God is said *free* indeed in the meaning of the Apostle. Not upon the account, I say that man cannot merit at Gods hand, (though it be true that *our works do not merit*) as our Divines ordinarily only inform us, seeing both that God can be made debtor,



debtor *ex pacto, regimine gratie paterno*, and Christ who became man did merit for us : but upon the account here mentioned ; which is a most direct answer to the doubt proposed, how the grace of God can be free, which is not tendred and obtained but upon condition ; and I declare that Gods abatement of the terms, and requiring a *new* condition is that which therefore makes it free, seeing it is tendred and obtained without performance of the *old*. As also that the new being *unequal*, hinders not *grace*.

The second thing wherein St. *Austin* is out, is in his interpretation of *Works*. It is manifest that *Paul* speaks of works in such a sense, as no man living can perform them, and upon that account no man can be justified by them. But if the interpretation of this Father, and the Papists after him were true, that by works we must understand works only that are done before a man is regenerate, or before he hath the help of the spirit, then may a man who is regenerate, and hath its help, perform the works that the Apostle speaks of, and so be justified by them. And then must his doctrine be false that comes to this universal conclusion. *Wherefore we conclude that by the works of the law shall no flesh living be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin.* On the other side, when some Protestants conceive that the Apostle speaks of our works in general, and accounts that we are not justified by *them*, because it is by the *righteousness of Christ* that we are justified, I cannot but think they are out likewise. For if when *Paul* sayes we are not justified by *works*, his meaning were, not by our *own works*, but by the obedience of *Christ* wrought for us : then when *James* sayes we are justified by *works*, his meaning must be by the *works Christ did for us*, and he must not mean our *own*. But this is absobant to any rational apprehension to construe St. *James* so. Nor do I think such a meaning ever came into the heads of either of the Apostles. Our Divines then should not say here of our works in general, but as to the sense the Apostle speaks of them in general, we are not justified them. And what is that sense then in which he speak of *works* ? why he speaks of works in that sense most manifestly as the *Law* require them, *that we may live in them*. Let a man then have the help of the spirit, or be



without it, so long as he falls short of what the law requires at his hands, be it never so little, he cannot *live* by those works; the curse is due to him for the least breach, and that is contrary to justification. There are some Divines of note therefore, seeing no footing for this distinction, have chose an other. There are works of the *Law* (say they :) and works of the *Gospel*. When St. *Paul* sayes we are not justified by *works*, he speaks expresly of *works of the Law*: St. *James* is to be understood of the *works of the Gospel*. This distinction may serve well, provided it be cloathed with the sense of the Apostles. When some have used these terms to signify no more but that we are not justified by Jewish observations, but by the righteousness of the Gospel, it falls too short in the first branch to do any thing. But by the *works of the Law* let them understand *works which answer the law*, and that there are none justified by the *works of the law*, because there is none perfectly fulfil it, and they have hit the business. For though *Paul* speaks not only of works by the law of innocency, but directly and mostly of the works of the Jewish law, which the Jews fancied, *ex sufficientia & praestantia legis*, did as such, procure pardon and life, without looking to the merits of the Mediator for it, and so erred: yet the law of *Moses* consisting either in *moral* precepts that represented the law of Nature which no man can come up to, and the most righteous of them did break: or in the *remedying* commandments of sacrifices or attonements for sin, whose virtue alone did lye in the blood of the Redeemer: the ground and bottom of their errour which he confuteth does indeed lye herein, that whatsoever it was they did, or whatsoever they thought of it, it did fall short of the law of works, therefore did not justify them before God. There are works then which if they be performed doe *answer the law*, the law we are to mean ultimately as given to mankind in a Covenant by our creation: and works which if performed do not *answer the law*, but answer the Gospel. If the distinction before-cited be received with this meaning, it is true that *Paul* speaks of the works of the *law*, and *James* of the works of the *Gospel*; and that there is no man justified by the *former*, because there is no man does or can perform them, when we do perform the *latter* and are justified by

by them. To give more light and weight to this. There are works which if we be justified by them exclude grace : and there are works which exclude not grace though we be justified by them. The works of the law, take them in this sense, that answer the law if they be performed, must make justification due so as it may be challenged according to the law; the reward shall be of debt, and there be no need of grace but justice in the case, for he that doth them ought of right to live in them. And these are the works undoubtedly that *Paul* disputes against, while he proves justification to be of grace; which is also agreeable to the end and scope the holy Ghost seems to have in it, to wit, the beating man down from all vain exaltation in himself, and laying him at Gods feet for all he has. Wherein it were not yet enough that what he hath is received, seeing he would be even ready to boast of this, that he hath received what others have not : but that when he is enabled by God to perform that which he does, even this which he hath received, and is accepted, is but such as God Almighty might choose whether he would accept it or not, and if it were not for *grace*, for all he hath done, he could not yet be justified and saved. On the contrary hand therefore, the works of the Gospel, that is the works which the Gospel requires of us as the condition of our justification and salvation, such as faith, repentance, and new obedience, when they are performed, and answer the *Gospel*, they do yet stand in need of grace, because they do not answer the *law*, and God might chuse whether he would accept them or no, or make any promise to them. When we repent it includes the acknowledgment of sin, and when we believe, it is a flying to Gods mercy for it, and though we may walk *sincerely* before God, we do not, and cannot walk *perfectly*, and he might condemn us in justice for the least failings, and much more for our manifold transgressions. If God then shews mercy, and accepts of what we do, it must be of his grace that he does it. It is true that these works do justify us, but that is while we are judged at the bar of Gods grace, or according to the new Covenant, which is therefore called a Covenant of grace, or the law of grace, because that grace is no wayes destroyed, but confirmed by these works. From whence it may appear that the two A-

postles.

poſſes ſhall be ſo far from contradicting one another about this point, as that what St. Paul contends for, ſhall be made good by that which is ſaid by St. James. Paul ſayes we are juſtified by grace, and St. James proves it, while he ſhews us that our works which are imperfect (even ſuch as Rahabs as well as Abrahams) are accepted and rewarded as if they were perfect, that is, are imputed to us for righteouſneſs, which they could never be but for grace, and that purchaſed through the redemption which is in Chriſt Jeſus.

The third thing wherein St. Auguſtine miſtakes, is that which ſtrewes the way to the Papiſts doctrine of juſtification by works : and therefore it will be neceſſary before I come to it, to advance here ſomething out of this Father which offers us I think ſome light towards the fixing our own doctrine of juſtification by faith. *Per legem cognitio peccati : per fidem impetratio gratia contra peccatum : per gratiam ſanatio animi a vitio peccati : per animi ſanitatem libertas arbitrii : per liberum arbitrium juſtitia dilectio : per juſtitia dilectionem legis impletio.* De ſpir. & lit. c. 30. By the law we have the knowledge of ſin : by faith we impetrate Gods grace againſt ſin : by grace the ſoul is healed from corruption : by that healing we have liberty of will : by this liberty we come to love righteouſneſs : by the love of righteouſneſs we perform or fulfil the law, and ſo are juſtified. Faith then does juſtify according to him, as *exordium hujus ad ſalutem connexionis* ( ſo he expreſſes it c. 31. ), as the beginning work that brings on the reſt which follow in this connexion, or as the foundation link in this chain of our ſalvation. That we may be ſure of his judgment herein this muſt not go without ſome quotation, from one of his latter books alſo. *Ex fide autem idcirco dicitur juſtificari hominem, non ex operibus, quia ipſa prima datur, ex qua impetrentur cetera, quæ proprie opera nuncupantur, in quibus juſte vivitur.* The Apoſtle ſaith a man is juſtified by faith and not by works, becauſe it is faith that is firſt given, from whence they follow, or by which the grace of God to lead a holy life is obtained. *De prædeſtinatione ſanctorum, l. 1. c. 7.* And unto this will I add the ſuffrage yet of a greater Authour, the Son of Sirach, Faith is the beginning of cleaving to God.

There may be here therefore two queſtions, *de fide. Qua juſt-*

*justificat, and quâ justificat.* What faith it is that justifies us? and, how faith justifies us?

For the former it is agreed easily. That faith which *worketh by love*, as St. Paul speaks, or that faith which is *made perfect by works* as St. James speaks, and no other is that which justifies us. There are some Divines make faith a complex thing to comprehend repentance and obedience under it. Faith, say they, is the receiving Christ both as Saviour and Lord, or the receiving him upon the terms of the Gospel: and it is no wonder if they say faith alone justifies us, when this faith alone is no less with them then the whole condition which the Gospel requires of us to our justification. Others do distinguish *faith, repentance, and obedience*, and say, that it is not *faith alone*, but *repentance and new obedience* also is required to justify us. And both these sorts of Divines say but the same thing in effect, and agree in their meaning. When the Scripture therefore sayes, *If thou believest thou shalt be saved, or if thou repentest thou shalt be saved*, Bellarmine sayes such Texts must be understood with the supposition *si cetera adhibeantur*, that is, *if that which is required also else where is supplied*. Thou shalt be saved if thou repentest, provided thou also believest: and if thou believest thou shalt be saved, provided also thou repentest and walkest sincerely before God. I mean, provided thou resolves upon a changed upright life, and if thou art not prevented, bringest this resolution to practice, there being no doubt but if a man dye before opportunity, his consent to the Covenant is to be reckoned for obedience, and baptism alwayes washes away sins with the Fathers. *Non concluditur legitime* (saies a judicious Protestant Divine) *a positione unius desperati ad negationem alterius: neque ab eo quod aliquot locis docetur, ad negationem eorum quæ alibi asseruntur.* And this I take to be more after St. Austin and St. James, who do both methinks make faith the *initium & fundamentum* (to use his words) the foundation and entrance to obedience and good works, and so to justify us as it is productive of them. We shall reconcile all I hope if we say only, that faith indeed may be distinguished, when not divided from our obedience in our justification. That is in short, *faith*, is one thing, and *justifying faith* is another, and yet justifying faith retain the common nature.

ture still of *faith*. Justifying faith, I take it, is such a believing of, or trusting to Gods mercy, that he will pardon our sins if we repent and walk sincerely before him (which are the terms obtained for us through Christs redemption), as produces that repentance and sincere walking. It is such an *assent* to what God reveals, as carries the *heart* and *life* along with it. I believe his *promises* (to wit effectually) when I so trust them, as to do the things he requires of me to obtain them. I believe his *precepts* when I keep them. I believe his *threats*, when I abstain from the evil he forbids, to avoid them. I believe the *Gospel*, when I become Christs Disciple. *Crede* is *fidelis esse* according to *Salvian*, and to be faithful is to doe our duty. *Well done good and faithful servant.*

For the latter, I do not apprehend seriously (if I may speak freely my thoughts, to which very end do I write) but that there is a great deal more stir and difference among Divines in this point of *justification by faith* then needs in late times. If any man might meerly by his believing Christ dyed for him, and hath carryed away all sin, be justified and saved, let him live as he list holding still but this persuasion, there were something in our contending for justification by faith alone, and a man would not be bereaved of the comfort of such a doctrine for the World. But when we all agree that whether good works do justify or no, good works in the *resolution*, and *practice* if not prevented, are necessary some way or other, so that no man living ever was or can be justified that is destitute of them, I doubt me verily our contention in this matter is rather *curious* then *profitable*, in shewing how faith *without works*, but not a faith, *which is without works* (at least in the will and intention) does justify. I know our Divines against the Papists contend that faith justifies in *sensu correlativo*, or in regard of the object, so as to be justified by Christs blood, and by faith is all one, that is by faith in his blood. The righteousness of Christ imputed is the *formal* say some, or as others had rather say the *material* cause of our justification, and faith justifies as an instrument. For my own part I will tell you therefore what I have sometimes set down for truth in my *contending belief*, and what I think in my cold *practical conceit* of the point.

As

As for my former thoughts I have some times pitched them thus. Justifying faith is the *receiving act* of a *working habit*, as hath the other act too to put forth upon trial, or else it is but a *dead faith*. Now this faith I have counted justifies as an *instrument*, not *mans*, who doeth not justify himself, but *Gods* instrument though *mans act*. This I have made out to my self thus. Unto justification there goes two things, the *imputation* of Christs righteousness for the discharge of sin, and accepting us unto life : and a *valid donation* of it to the sinner. The last is the ground of the former ; for man must be *made just*, or God cannot reckon him so, and acquit him in judgement. *The judgement of God is according to truth*. Now to this making a man just, as there is this *donation* of God, there must be *mans* receiving, Christ is not ours though tendered or given until we receive him. This receiving then (which is our act, that is faith it self ) God excites, and make use of to this end. He makes use of it (I have accounted) as his instrument of making Christ ours, to this end he hath appointed it for, that he may accordingly reckon his righteousness to us, unto the remission of sin and everlasting salvation.

Having told you this first, I may make the bolder to tell you my more indifferent thoughts of farther years. I do apprehend that the Apostles in their doctrine, and the Primitive Christians, had more simple and less intricate conceptions of things then we have ; and that their dispute then whether we are justified by faith or works, in the most simple understanding of it, contains no more than to shew us what is required of persons that they may be justified, or what is that God hath made the condition on our parts of our justification. *St. Augustine* I have said, does teach us that faith does justify us as the beginning and foundation unto grace and a good life, and the Council of *Trent* with *Bellarmino*, and the Papists after that Council stand upon this. Faith justifies only as *initium justificationis*, the beginning of justification. But howsoever the Papists have made use of that Father, the truth and light which he hath offered, is not to be lost ; I do take this to be the most right and certain notion that faith does justify as *initium* and *fundamentum* ; I will not say *justificationis*, seeing I understand not justification to be all one with sanctification as they do, but as *fundamentum*



*conditionis.* The condition of our full & final justification the Gospel offers, is repentance and sincere obedience, and faith is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of that condition. Was not Abraham our Father justified by works when he had offered his Son Isaac, sayes St. James? The faith of Abraham or his believing God, was the beginning and foundation of this excellent work, the ready offering his Son, which shewed his sincerity of life, the condition of justification. And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. Here believing & offering Isaac are all one with S. James. The offering Isaac proceeded from believing, as the *initium* and *fundamentum* of it, and so believing as the *initium* of sincerity of life or sincere obedience does justify. Such a faith as produces good works which are sincere though imperfect, or such good works as proceed from faith, are but one and the same thing with the two Apostles, and made by both the condition of our justification.

And here I should be willing to come off: but the uniform judgement of the reformed Churches on the Article of Justification requires some regard. There is therefore in the Schools, a *Quatenus specificative, & reduplicative*. I suppose when I have said that faith does justify us as the foundation of the condition ( and so productive of the whole of it ) I have said well with S. Augustine as to the *quatenus specificative*, and if I said nothing else it might be enough. Nevertheless, seeing it is but fit upon this account to speak yet a little more curiously, I must needs say farther, that I apprehend there is indeed something really in that which lyes in the concurring thoughts of our Divines, that faith hath, and must have a hand in our justification some way, as no other of our works or acts have. It is this, I believe that God will pardon me if I repent, and therefore I repent, as my faith now makes me repent and perform the condition, it justifies me, as to a *quatenus specificative*: but when I have repented and performed the condition, the duties I have performed are imperfect and sinful, and have need of mercy in point of law, and it is my faith yet must go to God for his acceptance of them through Christ when I have done. It is my faith, let me say, that must make up to me, out of the mercy or grace of God for Christs sake, what is wanting in that I have done



done, to make it such as he may impute it to me for righteousness, which else he could not. And as faith procures me this, or procures it thus, we have the *quatenus* also *reduplicative*, in the great question how faith justifies. It is faith makes me perform the condition, and then finds acceptance for it being done; and as it does both, it does *specificative*, and *reduplicative* justify the sinner. By this, it appears how faith hath an eye still to pardon according to the Protestant, while it is opposed to works in the point of justification, which is not only as respecting the pardon of all our sins upon the performing the condition: but as respecting that pardon more especially which goes into the very accepting the condition performed; for when there is imperfection still in our duty, and yet he accepts it, he must pardon also, what he accepts. And thus it is that the *just man* is said to *live by faith* in the most subtle conception. The works which the just man does are *his righteousness* most certainly, and that which justifies him; but they are short, and he could not *live* in them, but that faith supplies (as I speak) out of Gods pardon and grace, and consequently out of the Covenant for Christs sake, what is wanting otherwise for acceptation unto life. I do not say faith supplies this out of Christs merits, as if *his* and *our* obedience were mingled, to make up that *one* righteousness that justifies us: but that it is our works which we perform our selves, is the condition, and through Christs merits, both the imperfection is pardoned, and they accepted, according to covenant, upon faith. *It is of faith* sayes Sr. Paul, *that it might be of grace*. To be of *works*, is to need no grace: but to be of *faith*, is to have such works as need to be pardoned, even when they are accepted of God, for Christs sake, unto everlasting salvation. When *Augustine* does tell us so often that faith justifies, *gratiam impetrando*, let us take *grace* in *his*, and also in *our* acceptance, and both together will compleat the notion. Faith goes to God for his grace, or *help*, whereby we perform the condition, and so justifies us: Faith goes to God also for his grace or *favour*, to pardon and accept what is done for Christs sake, and so justifies us. As it does impetrate grace, or obtain his spirit for our duty: and then impetrates grace, or finds favour also for acceptance of it, take them both together, and we understand fully how we are justified by

Faith. As our trusting to a good man, does naturally draw out, win, or procure his assistance which yet is free and not of debt: so does our trusting in God for acceptance, when it hath first been effectual upon us to the performing our part to that end, procure the same from him to our justification. Let us take heed of making faith a *single* act as it does *specificative*: and a *complex* act, as it does *reduplicative* justify the believer. These are two extremes I think, and to be thus composed. And so you have my poor thoughts at full upon this vexed question.

I come then to the third thing wherein the Father is our, and that is in his notion of justification it self, which is the making us just, by infusion. This the Papists have so improved, as in effect to exclude pardon from it. For while they place the work of justification in the abolishing of all sin in the *baptized* and *justified*, so that there remains no longer any thing that is *peccatum*, but some *peccati* only, they do, I must say in effect, put us to dispute with them, whether there be any remission of sins at all, seeing the wicked are not pardoned, and the justified have their sins so done away by this infused grace, as to have none; and from hence does there spring their doctrine of *merit*, and *perfection*, which the controversie of *justification by works*, does carry along with it. Now I doubt not but the truth here (as it doth every where), is suffering between two thieves. That there is no *merit* or *perfection* I am convinced, and that our works do not *merit* because they are not *perfect*: but that we are justified by *works*, as we are by *faith*, St. James his words must goe as well as St. Pauls, and both must stand good, because faith justifies only as productive of works. Justification indeed is by *works*, but not *meritorious works*: by works which make the reward to be of *grace*, but not by works which make the reward to be of *debt*, so the Apostles are before reconciled. There are two questions then may adjust this great matter between Us and the Papists, or unto which the issue of our disputes on this point may be reduced. In the one they have the advantage of us, in the other we have the better of them. The lover of truth must be humbly hardned to follow its footsteps wheresoever he finds them, whither on the one side or the other.

The first question is, whether the righteousness we perform  
our

our selves, or that Christ performed for us, be the *matter* of our justification? and I say, the faith, repentance, new obedience, which the Christian through divine aid performs himself, is accepted with God for Christs sake unto pardon of sin, and eternal life. It is true, the obedience of Christ wrought for us, does justify us *suo genere*, by meriting the pardoning, justifying Covenant, which is the donative instrument of pardon and life: But if the question be askt, whether we have performed that which this instrument requires as *conditio tituli*, it must be our own faith and repentance here that is the *matter* of our righteousness. A man may be just in respect to the law of innocency, which no man but Christ ever was: or in respect to the law of grace, which all are, and must be, that are saved. Again, a man may be just in respect to the *perceptive* part of a law: or the *retributive* part. It is Christs righteousness and sacrifice alone that justifies Us in regard of the one, but not so in regard of the other: yet is it that alone which is the meritorious cause both of the acceptation of what we do, and freedom from the Laws condemnation. The second question is, whether salvation then and justification is not according to our *merits*? And I answer, as the Scripture is cleer and full from one end to the other for the *affirmative* in the *former* question: so is the Apostle Paul as full and cleer and positive as can be for the *negative* in the *latter*. What is it indeed he bears upon but this altogether? that there are no works in the earth (Christs excepted) that do merit: and that justification and salvation therefore are of grace. *Not of works, but of grace*. What is that in the sense and meaning, but as much as if he should have said it in expresse terms, not of *merit*, but of *grace*, or, not of works that are meritorious, and would make the reward to be of debt: but of such works that though they be rewarded, it is of grace, and more then in justice according to the law, God needed to have done. For this is the meaning of the Apostle in excluding of merit. There is a paternal government according to the law of grace wherein the denial of a reward due to our works were to overthrow all religion: A good child by his filial behaviour merits love and benefits: We dispute not unless *de nomine* only, against such a merit as this. But as to a merit in

in Gods *strict distributive* justice according to the law of works or any other justice which should make our works to be meritorious *ex condigno, non solum ratione pacti & acceptationis, sed ratione operis*, as Bellarmine with the Papists does speak, St. Paul is full in the deryal. It is nothing else certainly but the misapprehension of the word *grace* in St. Austin, received by the Church of Rome from him, that could have blinded them so in this point. I have shown his mistake in this term, and in those of *works*, and *grace*, and have and do here give you the right sense of each according to the Apostle. The certain truth is this, God gave a law to man according to his creation, and if he had performed that, or any of us could perform that, then should he as Creator and Rector be engaged to reward the performance according to this law, so that the reward should be of right : but seeing man is fallen, and no Person on earth does or can perform that law, there are no works on earth that do properly merit, or no man on earth that can be justified, if he have only his desert by his works. This is undoubtedly the very entendment of the Apostle. That all *boasting* and *merit* may be excluded from the world, while it is proved that no mortal is justified or saved but by *grace*. And what need further conviction in this matter ? we have the Papists own words, and general confessions, that they are all sinners, and that it is through Christs merits that they merit. If they are sinners then have they not these works that are meritorious, but it must be of mercy that they are not condemned ; and if it be through Christs merits that they merit, then is the reward not for the work sake, but for *his*. And what is it that Christ hath *merited*, that they should *merit* ? It must come to this, that Christ by what he hath done for us, hath merited or procured this grace or favour from God, that he should accept of our imperfect performances, which could not else be accepted, to salvation. Of this grace he hath made and promulgated the *promise*. Upon the promise the reward becomes *due*. A reward upon promise the condition being performed, becomes debt. And thus if the Papists say their good works merit, the use of the word is common with the Antients. Well then, let me recount this back to them, their good works merit, that

that is only, they make the reward due from God. They make it due from him, that is only because of his promise. *Debet sibi, non tibi*, sayes the Father. This promise is only of grace, or made freely out of favour procured by Christ. Our good works then must have such a merit attributed to them, as makes the reward due only of *grace*. and for *Christs sake*: and not such as makes it due of *right* or justice, and for the *works sake*. And such a merit; what is it indeed but no merit, or but a word only? It is such a merit as our perfect works which answer the law would have if we did them, to make the reward to be so of *debt*, as *not* to be of *grace*, that we dispute against, and the Apostle, in this doctrine of justification.

To return to *Augustines* error. Justification I verily believe is to be taken in the Protestants notion, who do no less truly and judiciously, then industriously distinguish sanctification and justification: and when they place the one in the work of the spirit renewing the whole man, and enabling us to dye unto sin, and live unto God. do place the other in an act of Gods grace whereby he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous for Christs sake. As for what they add usually in the definition that Christs righteousness is imputed to us, and made ours by faith as an instrument, I must confess they are notions, which as they never came into the head of St. *Austine*, nor were received (I suppose) in the Church till within a century or two of years since: so do I question whether a Century or two more may not wear them quite away again. That the righteousness of Christ performed in the whole course of his life and death was so pleasing, acceptable, and satisfactory to God, that the whole World upon that account, or for the merit of it, stands reconciled to him so far as that he hath vouchsafed a universal conditional pardon, or law of grace, to all mankind, according to the tenour of the Gospel, and consequently that every Person who truly repents and believes, are made partakers thereof in regard of this benefit, or in the effect, is a truth which we embrace: but when this very phrase of the imputation of Christs righteousness is not found in the Scripture, and the terms are used constantly in such a sense as if we were to be taken for perfectly righteous in Christs obedience, and to have  
satis--

satisfied the law in his sufferings all one as if our selves had performed the same, that is, as if it were ours, *in it self*, and not only in the *benefit*, or as to the end or intent Christ performes it for us, it is a conception of such another extreame to that of St. *Augustines*, as requires also our equal rectification.

It is manifest through the Scripture, that good works, holy duties and performances of men and women, are accepted of God, and so accepted, that they are rewarded by him with eternal Salvation. *If thou wilt have life, keep the commandements. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, eternal life. I have fought the good fight, therefore is laid up for me a Crown of righteousness. Come ye blessed of my Father, for when I was a hungry ye fed me.* If then the keeping the Commandements, a patient continuance in well doing, the fighting the good fight, and our works of charity be produced in judgment, as that for which we are declared righteous, absolved and pronounced blessed, It must be in some sounder then the ordinary sense, that our Divines bring in the righteousness of Christ to be imputed to us for our justification; which if it be more then absolution from sin, and acceptation of us to eternal life, let it be weighed and judged.

In *Ezekiel* the Lord is speaking of the righteous man, and repenting sinner. *When the righteous turneth from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, shall he live? his righteousness shall not be mentioned, but in his sin which he hath sinned, he shall dye.* Again, *If the Wicked turn from his sinnes and does that which is right, all his transgressions which he hath committed shall not be mentioned; in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live.* It is apparent from hence, that there is a righteousness which is a mans own, a righteousness which he hath done, wherein the righteous man that continues in it, or the penitent sinner that turns to it, shall live. To live in a mans righteousness beyond doubt, is all one to be justified by it. *He that doth them saith the law shall live in them*, that is shall be justified by them. If you make a question, there is another Text must convince you. *The just man shall live by his faith.* What is it to live by our faith? that you will not deny, is to be justified by it; for the Apostle alleadges this Scripture to prove justification

fication by Faith. Well ! There is no man of reason now can imagine that the righteousness which is here spoken of, is Christs righteousness, and yet the righteousness which is here, is that, a man shall live in. It follows, that it is not therefore the righteousness of Christ from without imputed, but the righteousness which man himself does (through Christ indeed and his spirit assisting) whereby he must be justified and saved. It is by his *faith* that he shall live in one Prophet, and by his *righteousness which he hath done*, in another. Put them together, and they come to one, as they must doe, and that is, by the righteousness of faith ; to wit, by that righteousness of life, or holy working which faith produces in a godly mans conversation, and which God requires every where as the condition of the forgiveness of his sins, and the acceptance of him to life everlasting.

It is observed by *Arminius* that the Apostle does several times in one Chapter ( I forget the number, ) tell us that faith is imputed for righteousness. That *Abrahams was*, that ours *shall*, or *is*, again and again. But it is no where said that Christs righteousness is imputed to us for righteousness. Indeed the phrase could not be so used. We might say properly enough ( supposing it true in the common construction ) that Christs righteousness were imputed : but not imputed for righteousness. For to be imputed for righteousness is to stand one in stead of perfect righteousness, which cannot be said of Christs, seeing that it self was most perfect. A thing cannot be accounted instead of that which it is. This Argument now of *Arminius* is good. It is faith which is a mans own act that is imputed for righteousness, therefore, not the righteousness, acts, or obedience of another. But when this acute Divine would introduce a notion hereupon, that the *verbo credere*, therefore must justify us, and not *works*, or not the *verbo operari*, it is both an ill and weak conceit, which is neither of use nor value. For as the Scripture speaks of *faith* being accounted for righteousness, so does it tell us that *Abrahams offering his Son*, and *Phineas act* were accounted to them for righteousness, and that *Rahabs* hiding the Spies did justify her. That is, it is faith as productive of works, or works as produced by faith that receives

D

the



the reward of perfect righteousness, which is, we are to remember also for Christs sake, or through his merits; not imputed to us as proprietors, but prevailing with the Father for such terms for sinners as answers our redemption and grace of the Gospel.

I would fain know of any man who is most Orthodox in his complexion, whether he does, or is able to think, that *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Job*, who were before the law, *Samuel*, the *Kings* and *Prophets*, who were under the law, or any man or woman whatsoever before the coming of Christ, did ever imagine that they were righteous, and to be accepted with God for the obedience which the *Messiah* should perform in their behalf when he came into the world, and that the believing this was an instrument of making it to be theirs, and so to be imputed to them which it could not be else: or whether they did not look on themselves to be righteous by doing righteously, and to obtain Gods favour by their upright walking with him, and no otherwise in the World? They judged not their own righteousness the meritorious cause of pardon to answer the Curse of the Law of Innocency, but they believed in Gods mercy, and so repented, obeyed, and were saved through the Redeemer. *And Enoch walked with God, and God took him.* Blessed is the man sayes *David* who walks in his wayes, and to whom he imputeth no sin. In the acceptation then of a mans own upright walking, and in the pardon of his sins, did our justification and blessedness lye in *Dauids* time: and in the same no doubt does it lye still under the Gospel. I would yet fain know whether any of the Disciples, *James*, *John* or *Paul* himself, whether *Clement* Roman, or *Alexandrine*, *Iustin Martyr*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, or any of the Fathers, whether Councils, or School-men, whether *John Hus*, or *Wickliffe*, or any famous or holy Writer (without resting on some bare incoherent scraps of sentences) did ever understand, or receive the full notion of faiths instrumentality, and the imputation of a passive righteousness before *Luther*? And if not, whether it be possible it should be of any such moment as is made of it by most Protestants? It was an Article indeed that rained in *Martins* heart, and I do therefore give it my obeysance: but it is no

Article

Article I take it, as the remission of sins is, in the Creed of the Apostles.

If the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us (as if it were ours in it self) it must be the righteousness of his *active*, or *passive* obedience, or *both*. If his *active* obedience be imputed to us, then must we be lookt upon in him as such who have committed no sin, nor omitted any duty, and then what need will there be of Christs death ! how shall Christ dye for our sins if we be lookt on in Christ as having none at all ? If Christs *passive* obedience be imputed, then must we be look't on as such who in Christ have suffered and satisfied the law, and born the full curse of it ; and then how shall there be room for any pardon ? The man who payes his full debt by himself or surety, can in no sense be forgiven by his Creditour. Indeed the Argument of the *Socinian* from pardon against Christs satisfaction is not valid : but it is good against the imputation of it to us as if we our selves had satisfied. Christ may have wrought with the Father (or made him that satisfaction as) to procure new terms, so that a man may be justified as a fulfiller of them, and yet need pardon for non-performance of the old. If Christs active and passive obedience both are imputed, then must God be made to deal with man according to the *Covenant of works* in the business of his justification, when nothing is more apparent in the Scripture than that by *grace* it is, that a man is justified, and by *grace* saved. If nothing less then such a righteousness as does both answer, and satisfy the law also, and that fully, will suffice for the sinners plea to free him from condemnation, he is not judged by the *law of grace*, but he is judged by the *law of works*, out of question. There were no need to bring this notion of Christs imputed righteousness into the Church, but that our Protestants mistake themselves, and forget that we are justified and saved by the *Covenant of Grace*, and not by the law of *Moses*, or *Covenant of our Creation*. Christ came into the World to procure and tender a new law, and in this regard is he said to be our Law-giver : not that he hath given any other moral rules of life to us (for we know his commandment only is *Love*) than what was contained in the Law before, wherein some do but boldly impose upon themselves

and others : but that he hath given the same precepts with *indulgence*. If God then shall not deal with man in his justification here, and at judgment according to that *indulgence*, or according to the law now in Christs hands, that is according to the Covenant of Grace, the main business of Christ coming and redemption were lost. You shall hear a Protestant in his prayer appealing from the Tribunal of Gods justice, to the throne of his grace, and yet in his Sermon be telling the people that it is nothing else but the perfect obedience and satisfaction of Christ imputed to them that saves them ; which is to bring them back from the *throne of his grace*, to the *bar of his justice* to be judged. Such appeals have been received I suppose from the Fathers, as very significant of truth, and their meaning ; but not agreeable to this notion.

In the last place, there is a righteousness revealed in the Gospel, that God went by in his dealing with all the holy men and women who were before Christ, and which he goes by in his dealing with us now and all the World, whereby it is that we are justified in opposition to the *righteousness of works*, the which together with the *grace of the Gospel* in the true sense and import thereof, is kept out of the *Protestant understanding* by this notion of the rigid imputation of Christs righteousness in it self, that being also but a late and forced notion, and not tending to holyness of life, (though they have bin holy men that have received it.) It is on the hearts I find of several Persons, and sorts of Persons disagreeing otherwise in their way (the providence of the Almighty who is the Authour, being the Conductor of all truth to its proper use and end,) to shew themselves against it, and to advance this tenet (if I may offer the determination) to the contrary. That the justification of a sinner is not by the imputation of Christs righteousness made his in it self by faith as an instrument : but by the *righteousness of faith*, to wit, by Christs righteousness, as the meritorious cause, and his faith and resolution first, and sincere obedience added after, as the condition of pardon and life through him : or by our sincere obedience proceeding from faith, which being in it self but imperfect as to the Law, is imputed for righteousness to the sinner for Christs merits sake, through the grace of the Gospel.

But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested

felted, having witness of the Law and the Prophets. *Si ergo nunc manifestata est, etiam tunc erat sed occulta.* If it be now manifested, it must have bin before lying hid. *Aug. de peccato originali cont. Pel. & Cel. c. 25. Et tunc ergo ista gratia mediatoris erat in populo Dei, sed tanquam in vellere pluvia.* And then was there this grace of the Mediator among Gods people as the rain in the fleece, that is, though unseen or not understood. *Ib.* I observe here that the righteousness of God, and the grace of the Mediator, is rightly made by this Father to be one. We are said to be justified by grace, and not by works: so by the righteousness which is of God, and not of works. What then is that righteousness of God which is the grace of Christ, and by which we are justified? By this grace and righteousness, it is certain, that *Austine* understands inherent grace, which is a quality infused by the Spirit in our hearts, enabling us to good works, and that this way do the Papists go after him, according to what also is said before. *Istam quippe gratiam qua justificamur, id est, qua Charitas Dei diffunditur in cordibus nostris— De gratia Christi, c. 30.* that is, the grace whereby we are justified, is no other but the love of God shed abroad in our hearts, or the grace of Charity whereby faith is made perfect, and so justifies as they and he agree. Now this grace is opposed to works, and called the righteousness which is of God, and not of works according to them (which hath been said before likewise) because it is that which is given or infused of God, and not wrought by our own strength, or procured by our deserts. *Justitia ex lege dicitur qua fit propter legis mandatum, justitia ex Deo dicitur qua datur per gratiae beneficium. Ib. c. 12.* That is said to be the righteousness of the law or of works, which is done through the strength of our selves only upon the command: that is the righteousness of God which we are helped to do by the benefit of grace. Again, *Non dicitur justitia nostra sed Dei, quia sic fit nostrum ut nobis ex Deo. It is not said our righteousness, but the righteousness of God because it is ours so as to be first given of God.* In the same Chapter and Book. The truth is, this Father being possessed with his own dispute, as it is incidental to the mind to fashion all things according to the impressions it hath received, does frame such a meaning still in the words of the Apostle, as if

if *Paul* as well as he, were purposely writing against *Pelagius*. There are three things in the soul said that learned Person, *Posse, Velle, & Esse, Possibilitas, Voluntas & Actio*, as *Aufstine* expresses it, the *Power*, the *Will*, and the *Deed*. The grace of God he accounted was conversant only about the *Power*, and not the *Will*, or the *Action*. Not that he placed all grace only in the giving the power, for that must confound Grace and Nature indeed quite, seeing all have the power: but allowing grace to lye in divine help the power alone he held was aided by God, and the will left to its self. This aid now in explaining himself he confined to Doctrine. God he said does reveal what he would have done in his law, and in the gospel, and gives us besides Christs example, and then the will of it self (the power alone thus helped) embraces that which is good. *St. Augustine* therefore sets himself to prove, that God does not assist us only by his word, but by operating on the will, and giving us hearts also to do it. And for as much we do nothing of our selves but by his help, or by the operation of his spirit, it is by grace, sayes he, that we are justified, and not by works. *Quomodo est gratia si non gratis data? quomodo est gratia si ex debito redditur?* How is it grace if it be not of free gift? How is it grace if it be rendred as debt? *De gra. Chr. c. 23.* Again, *Non enim Dei gratia erit ullo modo nisi gratuita fuerit omni modo.* It cannot be the grace of God at all, if it be not free altogether, *De pec. or. c. 24.* One would think this Father in such speeches as these had imbibed the Protestant notion of grace; but we are mistaken, for his thoughts still ran upon the Grace of God infused in our hearts, that is, the inherent work of the spirit which he pleads to be *gratuitous*, because it is not at first given for our merits. The works which we do of our selves without grace he accounts merits nothing, but are splendid sinnes: the works which we do from grace or by the spirit do justify according to him, and merit eternal salvation. *Quod si vocatus vocantem secutus fueris, quod est in libero arbitrio, merebitur & spiritum sanctum per quem bona possit operari: in quo permanens quod nihilominus est in libero arbitrio, merebitur vitam aeternam quae nulla possit labi corrumpi.* But if he that is called shall follow his call, which is in our free will, he shall merit the holy Ghost, by

by whose help good works may be performed : wherein if he perseveres, which is no less in his power, he shall merit eternal life, which is perfect and never fadeth away. In lib. expos. ad Romanos. The Protestant meeting with this doctrine in the Papist are no wayes satisfied with such an interpretation. By the Righteousness of God therefore, as by the grace of God, opposed to works, they will by all means conceive of a righteousness without us, that is the righteousness of Christ, which is not ours by performance, but by faith. But neither the Protestants after Luther, nor the Papist after Augustine have hit the mind of the Apostle. The righteousness of God and grace opposed to works is really nothing else but the meritorious righteousness of Christ, procuring the pardoning Covenant of grace, and our performing the condition : that is, the righteousness of the Covenant of grace accepted by God for Christs sake, instead of the righteousness of the Covenant of works. Only we are to know this righteousness may be understood either with respect to God as it is all one I say with his grace : or with respect to Us, as it is all one with that, upon which this grace is vouchsafed. *Charitas Dei dicta est diffundi in cordibus nostris, non qua nos ipse diligit, sed qua nos facit dilectores suos : sicut iustitia Dei, qua iustieius munere efficitur.* As it is called the love of God whereby we are made to love him, so the righteousness of God whereby we are made righteous through his gift. Aug. de spir. & lit. c. 32. It is true that this righteousness is wrought in us by the spirit, and flowes not from our selves ; it is true also that as we performe it by his aid, it is our own work : yet is not the one the reason why it is called the righteousness of God, nor the other any hindrance why it should not be so called : for the reason lyes altogether in the opposition of it meerly to that of works. Let a man do all that he can, whether by his own strength, or by Gods aid, he can never come up to the law of works, or to a conformity to the terms of the Covenant of nature, or law of Moses, as it was a representation of that Covenant, so that by the deeds thereof he cannot be justified : and for as much as it pleased God therefore to vouchsafe us a new law, the law of faith, or grace, or the new Covenant having lower terms, that in the performance hereof, or in a conformity

formity only hereunto, the man who is a sinner in respect of the law, may be righteous, and so God just in justifying him; this grace and condescension of God being merely from his own good will, is called thus the *righteousness which is of him*, in opposition to the other which is of *nature*: and so were ours, or *mans righteousness* properly, if he could attain unto the same. But when he cannot attain unto that which is so by *nature*, whatsoever he attains, if it be less, must be a righteousness only through *grace*, which notwithstanding our shortness, God mercifully condescends to accept, instead of that which is perfect, through the merits of our Saviour, and in regard of that acceptation ( *N. B.* ) it is called *his*, or the righteousness *which is of him* (of his own freetender and allowance), when in regard of performance it is ours, though we do it by his help. Lo here the true key that opens the mind of the Apostle, and consequently the door to that treasure which depends upon it.

That which is said I know by our Protestants most to the quick is this, that *pardon* indeed is an act of meer *grace*, but *justification* is an act of *justice* according to law, and therefore mult Christs righteousness which alone does answer the law be brought in to justify the believer. But this is a mistake, for if justification lyes not altogether in pardon [ *Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven* ] it is at least one part of it, and the whole is expressly declared by the Apostle to be *by grace, being justified freely by his grace*. True indeed it is an act of *righteousness*; even a judicial or forensical act, that is according to law, but what law? not the *law of works*, but according to the *law of Faith*. It is an act I say of that *righteousness* of God, and no other which the Apostle sets forth in opposition to the *law* and *works*, and makes all one with his *grace*. To reckon it then an act of justice according to the Law, intending thereby the law of works, is to correct the Apostle, and to tell him we know better how we are justified by Christ than he. It is the understanding of this righteousness whereof we are now speaking will set us all right. It is Christs obedience and sufferings alone no doubt which could make any compensation to God for our sins,



sins, that he might without diminution to his honour as Law-giver, or Governour, recede from his first law, but when Christ hath by his satisfaction procured this that God should now deal with us by a new law, the remedying law, or upon other terms, the thing is manifest in itself, that the righteousness then which is pleaded and accepted for this satisfaction sake of Christ, must be this righteousness of the new law, or the righteousness of *faith* and not of *works*; which both denominates the performer righteous, and God just in justifying him according to it. *For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.* That is, as I construe it, Christ by his satisfaction hath procured that we should not be judged by the law of works, and consequently that righteousness, or justification, be attained if we do but perform the terms of the Gospel. *To declare I say at this time his righteousness that he might be just and a justifier of him that believes in Jesus. Who is made unto us of God,* (that is a phrase I take it signifying no more then through whom (one way or other) God would have us obtain all spiritual blessings) *wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.*

After this there are no texts I count (such as the last purposely mentioned) which are pressed by our Divines for their service before, that are able to carry such a burden. *He hath made him sin for us* (sin, as the expiatory sacrifice under the law is called sin) *who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* That is, he who was the immaculate Lamb was made a sacrifice for our sins, that we may become righteous with the righteousness of God, which he accepts through him. Christ as a Sacrifice redeems us from the law of sin, and purchases for us a law of grace: according to that law we have a righteousness which is accepted unto life through Christ. I pray note it therefore, it is not said that his righteousness might be made ours, nor that we might be made his righteousness: but that we might be made *the righteousness of God.* And what is the righteousness of God I have shewen you just now, and what in him likewise is declared here together with it, in these few words. *Ut simus iustitia Dei in ipso. Hæc est illa iustitia Dei, non quæ ipse iustus est, sed quæ nos ab eo facti.* That we should become the righteousness of God

in him. This is that righteousness of God, not whereby he is righteous, but whereby we are made so of him. *Augustine* again, in the last cited place. It is true then there is a righteousness, of faith, and righteousness of God (of faith as the root of the whole condition) which are one, and by which in opposition to the righteousness of works we are justified: but that this righteousness of God and of Faith, is only the obedience of Christs life and death which he performed for us, is assumed as much without reason, as any consent of that Father. To this purpose, I take it, is God styled in the Old Testament, *The Lord our righteousness*, that is, in his condescension to accept us for Christs sake as righteous by a law of grace, when in strict justice he might condemn us for sinners. It is not appropriated to the second Person, but to be understood of that Gospel goodness of God whereby he imputeth righteousness to us, when we have none according to the law of our creation, that is imputing the righteousness of faith to us without the works of that Covenant. *All our merits O Lord* (sayes the Father) *are thy mercy*. This is the true and excellent import of that expression, signifying moreover that God hath found out the means to demonstrate his justice no less fully (and his goodness more fully) to the World in saving us by this new law, through his Sons mediation, then if we had kept our first innocency, or underwent his eternal judgment for our transgressions.

Another text which is a fellow with this, I take it in sense and words, is that to the *Romans*. *As by one mans disobedience many were made sinners: so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous*: I comment these words thus. As through *Adams* sin we came into the state of the fall, and so do all sin, or are sinners against the law, which none fulfil: so by Christs obedience to his Father whereby he procured the grace of a new law for us we are brought to such a state, as that many become righteous, and are justified by the performance. That all man-kind is involved in *Adams* first sin, our Divines are agreed against *Pelagius*. The most understand this to come through the Covenant or Will of God: there are some apt to conceive only that *Adam* being the natural root of mankind, human nature it self sinned in him, and so when we come to exist.

exist, his guilt is derived upon our persons as *virtually* and *seminally* in him, no otherwise then *Levi* is said to have paid tyths to *Melchisedech* in the loyns of *Abraham*. I should incline to this explanation, but that I see not then why all the sins of *Adam* besides, and of all our Progenitors, should not be *ours* also upon the same account, as much as that *first* transgression. Distinguish we therefore between the *precept*, thou shalt not eat of the Tree, under this Covenant: and the *threatning* upon breach of it. The Precept plainly belong'd to our first Parents only, and as none of us broke that precept which we had not, so can we not be reputed to have that sin (in it self) which we never committed: nevertheless the penalty being by the Will or Covenant of God to extend to their progeny (which falls out ordinarily in mans laws also), that sin of *Adams* which *in it self* could be *his* only, in the *effects* threatned upon the commission does become *ours* also. God does so impute that act to us, that we are all, as well as he, deprived of original righteousness, corrupted in our nature, and sure to dye: In like manner (I take it) are we to conceive of the imputation both of our sins to Christ, and of his righteousness to us. Our sins are not laid upon him to make him a sinner: but to be a propitiation for our sins. He was not made sin or accounted a sinner, *quoad reatum culpæ*, as if he were guilty of our facts, but he was dealt with as a sinner, *quoad reatum pænæ*, in regard to the obligation unto satisfaction, which as a *Sponsor* he was to make in our behalf. The righteousness of Christ likewise which he performed as *Sponsor* or *Mediator*, cannot be *ours* either really or representatively *in it self*, because this righteousness as *Mediator* is proper to his Person, and is not the very same requisite of any, or all of us in the law it self: but his righteousness as *Mediator*, even his whole submission to the law of his Mediatorship in life and death, is *ours respectively* as to what it procured, or to what he intended it should procure, inasmuch as we are partakers of the benefits that derive from it. Our sins were *Christs* in the *causation* of his sufferings: *Christs righteousness* is *ours* in the *effects* of pardon and life eternal.

A third text, and which carries our Divines I think more then any, is that to the *Phillipians*. I count all things but loss

that I may win Christ, and be found in him not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. In these words, our Protestants observe that the righteousness of God, and of faith, is opposed to that righteousness which is our own, and therefore it must be a righteousness without Us, received by faith. But they are mistaken, for, besides that the righteousness of faith and of God, is not the same with the righteousness of Christ, as hath been before observed, they are to know that this righteousness which Paul calls his own in this Text, is the righteousness of the Jew, that is, the Jews own, or his own as a Jew and a Pharisee; not our own, or his own as a Christian. This appears from the Verses before. *If any thinketh that he hath whereof he may trust in the flesh, I more, circumcised the eighth day, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee, as touching the righteousness which of the law blameless.* This appears farther from another text, which together with this alone is all that hath any such Antithesis in the Terms *ἰδίας δικαιοσύνης*, from whence they fetch this conjecture. *I bear them record that they have a Zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of Gods righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God.* It is certain now from these places both, that there is a righteousness which was Pauls own and the Jews own which he excludes from justification, and opposes to the righteousness of faith and of God: but this I say is not the Christian righteousness. The Christians faith and new obedience are his own acts out of doubt by Gods help, and his righteousness according to the Gospel: and you shall never read St. Paul saying, *I desire to be found in Christ not having my own repentance, my own faith, love, and new obedience, which are conditions of being found in him that we may be justified.* Pauls own righteousness as a Jew, or as a Pharisee I say is one thing, and Pauls faith and obedience which is his righteousness as a Christian is another. And this distinction our Saviour himself hath first offered. *Except your righteousnesss, exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees—* The righteousness of works is twofold. The righteousness

ousness of *Mankind*, according to the Covenant of Nature : and the righteousness of the *Jews*, while they reckoned to be justified by the external observation only of the rites of *Moses*. The one of these *exceeds* the righteousness of faith, and we are not justified by it, because no man can attain to it : the other *falls short* of the righteousness of faith, or of a true Christian, according to these words of our Lord, and for that reason, as for several others, the establishment of it was dangerous to their Salvation.

A last text they have, *what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh : that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.* It is urged here by a Perfectionist, that if the Protestant doctrine were true, it should be said that the righteousness of the law should be fulfilled in Christ, and not in us. But these words I apprehend may be a phrase of the Apostles, as the words *attaining unto righteousness* elsewhere : and so it will be all one as if he had said, *that we might be justified, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.* Nevertheless, there is this here must be known and noted, that when a Christian obeys God according to the Gospel, that obedience of his proceeding from faith, though imperfect, is accepted of God instead of the laws perfect righteousness, or stands him in the stead as if the whole law were fulfilled, which is the ground of such expressions. From whence in the way we may have light for the understanding the Apostle, when he tells us *the law is established by faith*, or uses the like words. The law is established only by the fulfilling of it : and faith as it works by love fulfils the law. But how ? why in the sense ( *N. B.* ) as is now told you. Faith produces obedience which is imperfect, yet answering the terms of the gospel, it is, through that grace and condescension from God which Christ hath purchased for us in the work of our redemption, imputed to us for righteousness, that is, accepted and rewarded so, as it is made to stand us in the same stead as the full performance of the law would have done, which is to justify us, and bring us life eternal.

When God made man he gave him a law suitable to his Creati-

on.

on. That law being founded in the image of God, wherein he was created, is most holy, equal, and unchangeable. God as Rector must deal with the World according to this law, so that man transgressing, he is engaged to proceed against him by it, unless there be some means found out that he may be no loser in his justice if he do not. There is nothing can be offered to God but his justice and holiness must be losers, if it be of consideration less valuable then that which the law it self required, which is the obedience of all mankind, or their everlasting suffering for its transgression. No Man or Creature but Christ alone could offer any such satisfaction as this for us. And this he offered in the obedience or righteousness of his whole life and death, as the price, sacrifice, ransom, propitiation for our sins: which through the dignity of the Person that offered it, being the Son of God as well as man, was of value which is infinite. That which exceeds a thing or is more in value then it, cannot be the very thing it self which in value it exceeds. The righteousness then of Christ is really imputed to man, tendered in his behalf, and made ours in regard of this effect (or *in the end to which it was intended* I will say, when it cannot be ours *in it self*), to wit, that God being satisfied or made no loser in his justice hereby, does deal with us otherwise then by that law unto which at first we were created. If he deals not with us then according to that, it must be by some other, which hereby also is purchased; and that is according to his *grace* or *righteousness* revealed in the Gospel. This grace or righteousness lyes in his acceptance of faith and repentance instead of perfect obedience for this righteousness sake of Christ thus imputed, and no otherwise then thus. When our Divines now say that there are no works of ours can stand before God in his district judgment, that they should be *causa propter quam, the cause for which*, (that is for the merit sake, or worthiness whereof) he should justifie any person, they say well; and there meaning is, that our works coming not up to the *original law*, God cannot for the performance of them, absolve us as no sinners: but yet seeing they are such as answer the terms of the Gospel, he does for Christs sake, or his merits sake, both pardon their imperfection, and impute them to us for righteousness, in the accept-  
ing



ing them to life, or rewarding them with everlasting salvation. In short Christs righteousness is imputed to us, but not for righteousness. It is for the *righteousness sake*, but not formally though efficiently by the *righteousness* of another, we are justified. It is not Christ, but our selves, that perform the new Covenant, and by the *new Covenant* is it, or by *grace*, that we are righteous in Gods sight. It is not consequently Christs sufferings or obedience only, but our faith, obedience, sincerity also, that is rewarded with salvation: yet is it not for the merit of this obedience of ours, but for his merits, or the merits of his righteousness. Behold ! this is the critical hidge upon which the whole controversie does turn. We will stand for the imputation of Christs righteousness (N.B.) so far as ever we can with holding justification by the Covenant of grace : but when some Protestants have stood for it so, as renders our justification to be by the *law*, or the Covenant of works, and not by *grace*, they have departed from the Apostle. And thus the dispute in the upshot will I think end in this, that Christs righteousness is the *meritorious*, indeed the *only meritorious*, or meritoriously procuring efficient, but must not be made the *formal cause* of mans justification.

And yet do I see there is need still of some more words, seeing here the heart of all lyes. A righteousness we must have if we be justified, and what is that righteousness ? There is a *legal* righteousness : and *Evangelical*. Christs righteousness our Divines account our Legal righteousness which must answer the law for us : and our faith and repentance must be produced to answer the Gospel. The latter of these I take to be plain : the former must be warily understood. There is the *Precept*, and the *Retribution* of the law. We must take heed that we conceive not Christ to be our legal righteousness in regard to the *Preceptive* part of the law (in the more frequent sense), as if we were reputed by God to have fulfilled the same, or satisfied it in him as representing our Persons, which is the error before confuted, and especially by the reason last mentioned, because this makes our justification to be by the *law of works*, (and not of *grace*) which subverts the Gospel : but there is a righteousness in regard to the *retributive* part of the law of works, consisting in our discharge from its curse and penalty,



penalty, which is a *righteousness of pardon*, and if any will call this our *legal* righteousness (which is yet conferred by the *Gospel*;) and account we have it in Christ, understanding nothing else by it, but that his righteousness is the meritorious cause of it, I know not any will oppose him. It is true, that *pardon* and *righteousness* without explication is a contradiction, and therefore when we allow of a *righteousness of pardon*, there is a *strict* and a *large* sense to be acknowledged of *terms* used in Scripture. Blessed is the man *unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works*. The imputation of righteousness to a person is to account him righteous; and for a man to be accounted righteous *without works*, that is without righteousness, is explained in the next verse, *viz.* to be *pardoned*. By *works*, he understands works of the *law* out of doubt, for without faith and repentance (or *Gospel* works) God imputes righteousness to none. Now how a man may be righteous according to the *law of grace*, and yet need pardon in reference to the *law of works*, the matter is plain: but to make a man *righteous* (through this pardon) in regard to the *retribution*, and *guilty* in regard to the *precept* of the same law, is to speak I account *Scripturalis licentia*, by leave of the Scripture. To be acquitted from the condemnation of a law by being pronounced innocent, or to be adjudged to the reward by being declared to have fulfilled it, is in the strict sense to be justified: To be acquitted from the condemnation, and be pronounced guilty, is to be *delivered* from the law, and not to be *justified*, but in a large sense of justification. Justification from a law, and not by it, is a catechetical speech, and I do question whether we should not (using a strict speaking) place the discharge of the sinner from condemnation, upon the score of Christ's redemption, rather than on the work of our justification. That God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself not imputing their trespasses does import an universal conditional remission bestowed upon all, so far as a delivery of the whole World over from the *law of works* to be judged by the *law of grace*; and when we are at that bar, there is no inquest like to be made about Christ's work whether he hath done his part; but whether we have done ours, that is performed our condition, and if we be found to have bin upright to God in the main

main bent of our hearts and lives, notwithstanding our manifold failings, he accepts of us for Christs sake, and declares us righteous according to this law: and so adjudges us to the reward or promise, which is to have Christ and his benefits, whereof one is the application of his redemption, and therein our discharge from the Law's condemnation. And thus methinks the Apostle speaks with more acuteness, where justification and redemption are *de industria* distinguished, and the one made the means or foundation to the other. *Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.* Redemption is the delivery of the World in general from the law, and so from its penalty on terms appointed by the Redeemer: Justification is the pronouncing of particular persons accepted upon those terms, and so to have a right to the purchased possession. In fine, there is but our own sincerity, and a right to impunity and life, is all the righteousness that we have, or that can go (in it self) to the justification of a sinner. The import of all is, we are not to conceive a sinner to be brought before two bars that he should have need of a righteousness of perfect obedience in Christ to plead against the law, for Christ hath redeemed us from coming before this barre, by the rancome of his blood paid for all the World: but being to stand only at one bar, it is but one righteousness is sought as the condition upon which the sentence must pass, and as for that Righteousness we have through Christ besides, which is in regard only to the *retribution*, not the *work* of the law, that is our Pardon, it comes to us by way of sentence, or as a part of the reward given upon the condition performed, but is not part of the condition, or the whole condition it self pleaded for our justification. Only the redemption of Christ, I count is to be first supposed, with the whole righteousness of his Mediatorship, as the foundation, through the merits whereof, this new covenant is purchased, and so the reward given, for his sake, upon that condition. And if it be for Christs sake, for his merits, righteousness, mediation, redemption sake, we see also how this righteousness of his, even his Mediatory righteousness which cannot be ours possibly *in it self*, is yet imputed to us and made ours in

the *effects*, or in the end to which it was performed, for salvation to Believers.

I will conclude all with the agreement of the two Apostles, which hath been already, but lightly, before touched.

When *Paul* then contends, that a man is not justified by the works of the law. By the works of the law, he means works as would justify him according to law if he had them, and says: no man is justified hereby, because no man hath them, as he proves at large in the first and second Chapters to the *Romans*, as the very business and scope of both, to any that will consider of the matter, and so pleads a necessity of their believing that they may be justified. But when *St. James* says a man is justified by works, he means not works that answer the law, or such as of themselves would justify the doer, which no man hath, neither *Abraham* himself, much less *Rahab* whom he also mentions, but such works as suppose grace to their acceptance through faith in the Redeemer, for the reconciling the Person, and covering his imperfections. And thus the two holy Penmen disagree not: but while the one saith, *I conclude a man is justified by faith without the works of the law*, and the other, *Thou see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only*, the sense of both is, that though a man hath not the works of the law (the works the law *quæ factus* requires of him) which would justify the doer if he did them (as for certain he does not, it being impossible for any to have these, so that if he be justified at all, he must be justified without them): yet is he justified by faith, provided that faith be accompanied with (or is the *initium* and *fundamentum* of) good works of another size; to wit, that will not make the reward to be of *debt*, but of *grace*, or that are imperfect and not able to justify him by law, yet are required in sincerity of life, together with his faith in the Redeemer (supposing him revealed, or else in the mercifulness of Gods nature) unto final justification, and salvation.

And now Reader, if thou art offended at this paper, I cannot help thy prejudice, but I desire thee to hear reason. If thou art sensible of that deadly advantage which is given to the Papists, by

by our ill treating this point, by the doctrine I mean more particularly, of Christs righteousness *imputed* in the unsound sense, especially when those that expound it worse, do ordinarily lay most stress upon it: If thou art sensible yet neerer home, what a stumbling block hereby hath been laid in the way of a late numerous Sect among us (whom to name methinks is some rudeness to them), that really having our Ministers here by the lock (that is the place where their only strength they have against us does lye), do reject the whole Tribe, as False Teachers that harbour men in their sins, and make Christ serve only to be a cover for them, as they bitterly traduce us, with great indignation, and in very earnest on this account (which I must confess hath affected me so much in reading their books, as to set me to write, and gives me yet a good conscience in what I do, though thou perhaps art angry with me for it): If lastly thou art sensible of the evil and danger of *Libertinisme* or *Antinomianisme*, which hath been lately so rife, though now allayed in this Land, what roots yet it hath alive in this notion mis-understood, thou wilt be advised with me, and others perhaps that see more then I, that it is time, that it is fit, this Sluce be stoppt. The *Presbyterians* are my Friends, and the *Independents* my Friends, and Others my Friends, but Truth is greatest, and must overcome.

*Deo Gloria mihi condonatio:*

JOHN HUMFREY.

---

### ERRATA.

**P**Age 9. l. 35. for *justified them*, r. *justified by them*. p. 10. l. 28. for *that*, r. *seeing that* (N.B.) p. 19. l. 14. for *perceptive*, r. *preceptive*.

---

### An Advertisement.

**T**Here is a Book came out this Terme, entituled, Two points of Moment Discussed, by the same Authour: sold by Mr. Million at the Bible in Fleet-street.

by our ill treating this point, by the doctrine I mean more par-  
 ticularly of Christ's righteousness, which is the unquenchable  
 especially when those that expound it, do ordinarily say  
 most freely upon it: It is not a doctrine, but a power, which  
 sanctifying blood, whereby had been laid in us, by a new  
 nature, set among us (whom to name ourselves, is to name  
 men to them) that really living, and full of life, and  
 (that is the place where their only strength they have taken in  
 does say) do respect the whole Trade, as False Teachers that have  
 from men in their line, and make Christ's blood only to be cov-  
 for them, as they directly render us, with their law, and  
 in very earnest on this account (which I will not say is  
 of me to much in reading their books, as to let me to write  
 give me a good conscience in what I say, though many  
 and angry with me for it, still they are sensible of the evil, and  
 danger of Labours, or of any kind of work, which is  
 to me, though now allayed in this land, what root  
 hath mine in this nation will be understood, as will be evident  
 with me, and others perhaps that do more than I in this  
 that it is in this place be those that are my Friends,  
 and the Inhabitant my Friends, and Others my Friends, but  
 Truths befall, and mine overcome.

Deo Gloria ubi condecoratur

JOHN HAMLEY.

# ERRATA.

Page 1. 37. for justified by law. p.  
 10. 1. 2. for that, seeing that (N.B.) p. 1. 2. 14  
 for precept, & precept.

## An Advertisement.

There is a Book come out this Term, entitled, Two  
 points of Morality, called, by the same Author:  
 (1st) Mr. Milton's Bible is Free from.